



BAPTISM:

ITS MODE AND MEANING AT THE TIME OF
OUR LORD.

HISTORICALLY AND PHILOLOGICALLY
INVESTIGATED.

BY

REV. W. A. MCKAY, B.A.,

Woodstock, Ont.

Author of "Immersion, a Romish Invention;" "Baptism Improved;"
"Salvation of Infants;" "Outpourings of the Spirit;" etc., etc.

"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."—1 THESS. v. 21.

TORONTO:

WILLIAM BRIGGS,

WESLEY BUILDINGS.

G. W. COATES, MONTREAL, QUE.

S. F. HUESTIS, HALIFAX, N.S.

BAPTISM:

ITS MODE AND MEANING AT THE TIME
OF OUR LORD

HISTORICALLY AND PHILOLOGICALLY
INVESTIGATED.

BY

REV. W. A. MCKAY, B.A.,

Woodstock, Ont.

Author of "Immersion, a Romish Invention;" "Baptism Improved;"
"Salvation of Infants;" "Outpourings of the Spirit;" etc., etc.

"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."—1 THESS. v. 21.

TORONTO:

WILLIAM BRIGGS,

WESLEY BUILDINGS.

C. W. COATES, MONTREAL, QUE.

| S. F. HUESTIS, HALIFAX, N.S.

PREFACE.

THIS pamphlet is mainly designed for classical readers, and is not intended to take the place of the author's former work, "Immersion, a Romish Invention." The same conclusion is reached in both, but by an entirely different line of argument. The question is: What was the import of the word *baptizo* in our Lord's time? To settle this question, the case is here carried to the highest court of appeal, the *usus loquendi* of the word up to that time. We overlook no known instance. We carefully examine each case, and we find that before the time of Christ, and for two hundred years after, the word was never used in the modern Baptist sense of dipping. Our argument is inductive, and our conclusion is co-extensive with our premises. That conclusion is therefore presented, not defiantly or arrogantly, but with the calm confidence of a demonstration. To the Baptist appealing to human opinions and traditions, our reply is, all you say goes for nothing so long as you are unable to maintain your position from the sacred or secular use of the word.

The late Dominion census shews that with the increasing light of our day, Pedit-Baptists are more than holding their own, while the proportion of Immersionists is steadily and rapidly decreasing. All that is necessary to the destruction of the dipping theory is a candid investigation of the historical development of the word *baptizo*. The author ventures humbly to hope that the day is not far distant when the intelligent mechanic will be more familiar with the meaning and power of baptism than are many of the clergy of the present time. When that day comes, "*immersio delenda est*." A house built upon water cannot stand.

W. A. M.

WOODSTOCK, Dec. 13th, 1892.

BAPTISM.

WHAT is the Scriptural mode and meaning of baptism? Around this question the storm of theological controversy has raged for a period of more than two hundred years, and the end is not yet. Immersionists contend that there is only one mode, dipping, or immersion in the sense of dipping. Dr. Carson, perhaps the ablest of all Baptist writers, says, on page 55 of his book, "My position is that it (*baptizo*) always signifies 'to dip,' never expressing anything but mode." He frankly admits, however, that in this opinion "all the lexicographers are against him." Dr. T. J. Conant, chairman of the American (Baptist) Bible Revision Committee, and a scholar of unquestioned eminence, does not find it so easy to translate this word. On the first page of his book, "*Baptizein*," he gives us seven different words whereby to render *baptizo* into English, and then throughout his book he translates by no less than fourteen words! His seven words are, "immerse," "immerge," "submerge," "dip," "plunge," "imbathe," "whelm." He informs us that none of these is the exact equivalent of the Greek word, but only what he calls the "ground meaning" common to them all. But what that ground meaning is he cannot find in the English language a word to express. This is rather a remarkable confession coming from the chief man in a denomination that regards it as an evidence of "want of common Christian honesty" not to translate but simply transfer the Greek word to the English Bible. A careful examination will

also convince the student that the words given us by Dr. Conant, as the equivalents of *baptizo*, are quite inconsistent with each other as to mode of action. "Dip" and "plunge" indicate the subject moved and put into the element; "immerse," "immerge" and "submerge" are equivocal as to mode of action, and may indicate condition as well as act; while "whelm" and "overwhelm" express the baptizing element coming upon the subject. "Immerse" does not imply totality, that is the province of "*submerge*." The immersion of the Greek church, ancient and modern, means no more than "the standing or placing *in* the water," not *under* it, while the priest pours the baptismal waters upon the head. The "baptismal tokens" represent this, and modern missionaries among the Greeks testify to it.* Such are the immersions which Calvin, Schaff, Stanley, and indeed all scholars, find in the ancient ("*veteri ecclesiae*"), not Apostolic church. They would not be recognized as baptisms at all by modern Baptists. Where then is the sense or honesty of quoting them in support of the "*dipping-submersions*" practised only since 1633?

The ambiguity of the Baptist usage of the word "immerse" is seen in the variations and contradictions of Baptist writers. Some, like Cox, Morell, and Fuller, tell us that "immersion may be by pouring," while others, like Dr. Carson (p. 36), declare that "if all the water in the ocean should fall on a man it would not be a literal immersion. The *mode* would still be wanting." The word in this way becomes a very Proteus under Baptist management. Sometimes it is partial, sometimes total; sometimes it means the act of putting into the water, and sometimes the act of standing in the water; and sometimes no act at all but only a condition which may be produced by pouring. It is evident that in a discussion like this, a word cannot be used in any one of half-a-dozen different senses according to the exigency

* See "Immersion, a Romish Invention," pp. 113-115.

of the occasion. There must be a clear, well-defined, uniform sense. We, therefore, demand of Baptists that they hold to the sense of this word which they illustrate in their practice. In their practice all Baptists agree with Dr. Carson that *baptizo* is a word of specific mode, always meaning "dip and nothing but dip through all Greek literature." "The command to baptize," we are told, "is a command to dip." "Baptizing is dipping, and dipping is baptizing." "To dip" is to take up, put into and under the element, and then immediately withdraw. Thus I dip the point of my pen in the ink. This is the precise action of the Baptist when he baptizes. And this and nothing else, he claims, is baptism, so that all undipped persons are unbaptized and unworthy to come to the Lord's table.

Baptist theory and practice demand not merely "dip" as a meaning of *baptizo*, but as its *only* meaning. "Nothing but dipping is baptizing," they tell us, and they hesitate not to debar from the Lord's table all undipped persons as unbaptized, and consequently unworthy communicants. It is, therefore, not enough for Baptists to show that there are instances where, as they think, the word means "dip;" they must show that there are no instances where it does not mean "dip." The careful philologist will perceive that such is the exclusive nature of the Baptist claim that it does not admit one solitary adverse instance. If, in these pages, we are able to point out one example in the whole range of Greek literature where the word cannot possibly mean "dip," then we have proved that dip is not the only mode of baptism, and the whole exclusive Baptist theory perishes. Let this point be carefully noted, a failure on our part to prove affusion in some of the instances will avail nothing for the Baptist theory, so long as there are other clear undoubted instances adverse to that theory—logically, one instance is sufficient. Our claim is, not that one instance merely, but all the instances, without one exception, are irreconcilably opposed to the dipping theory.

Over against the Baptist claim,

"Dip, and nothing but dip, through all Greek literature,"

I place this proposition:

In the whole range of Greek literature prior to the time of Christ, baptizo never, so far as the record tells us, had such a meaning as "dip" or "immerse" in the sense of "dip."

In every one of these ancient baptisms, secular and sacred, we find the baptizing element or instrumentality moved and brought upon the person or thing baptized; never once do we find the person or thing baptized moved, and put into and under water or any other element, and then immediately withdrawn, after the manner of the Baptists. The actual meaning of *baptizo* can be determined only from the usage. Lexicons are not a final authority; their definitions are worthless unless sustained by the instances. Too frequently, as Robert Young, LL.D., tersely observes, "Lexicographers follow each other like a flock of sheep," and Dr. Carson himself declares that "the meaning of a word must ultimately be determined by an actual inspection of the passages in which it occurs."

There are twenty-seven undoubted instances of the use of *baptizo* before the time of Christ. These we shall place, one by one, in chronological order, and in the original language, before the reader. Each instance we shall fairly translate, and examine with this crucial test, What was moved in this baptism: the baptizing element or the subject baptized? In every instance the answer is adverse to the dipping theory. The baptizing element is always moved, the subject never.

A word lest we may be misunderstood. We do not claim any specific mode for *baptizo*. It is not a modal word. It does not mean "to sprinkle" or "to pour" any more than it means "to dip" or "to immerse." The word itself determines nothing as to mode, but it expresses effect, state or condition, no matter how produced. Simi-

larly such English words as move, hurt, kill, destroy, please, displease, build, bury, anoint, purify, cleanse, wash, etc., indicate not the mode of inducing the state, but the state induced. A hurt B. But the question is always in place, How? for the word "hurt" does not indicate mode. So also A anointed B. We ask the question, How did he anoint him? for the word "anoint" does not indicate mode. And even the Baptist will answer that he was anointed by pouring. But still "to anoint" does not mean "to pour." So also A baptized B. The question may be asked, How did he baptize him? for the word "baptize" does not indicate mode any more than the words "hurt," "anoint," "cleanse," etc. *Baptizo* expresses any complete change of state or condition in whatsoever way effected. It has nothing to do with modes of action. "A blind man," says Dr. Dale, "could more readily select any demanded color from the spectrum, or a child could more readily thread the Cretan labyrinth, than could the seven wise men of Greece declare the nature or mode of any given baptism by the naked help of *baptizo*." (Classic Baptism, p. 353.) Similar are the words of the great Dr. Charles Hodge. In "Systematic Theology," Vol. III., p. 533, he says: "The fact is, *baptizein* does not express any particular mode of action. As to dye expresses any kind of action by which an object is colored; to bury, any kind of action by which an object is hidden and protected; so to baptize expresses any act by which a person or thing is brought into a state of being wet, purified, or even stupefied, as by opium or wine." So also the words of Robert Young, LL.D.: "From all this I gather that the word has no real specific reference to mode at all, but to the object, effect, or result contemplated." Even Dr. Conant in one place stumbles upon the truth, for on page 158 of "*Baptizein*," he says with italic emphasis, that "by analogy" the word "expressed the coming into a new state of life or experience." What a pity that he was so frightened of his own discovery that he never again

mentions it. In all his explorations among classic and patristic baptisms, he seems never to have found one instance illustrating his own definition of a "new state," etc. It is always with him "mode, and nothing but mode."

But while *baptizo* is thus non-modal, the effect, state or condition expressed must have been produced in some mode or form of act. This mode can usually be determined from the context and the surrounding circumstances. And our position is that the mode, as thus determined, is always by the baptizing element being moved and brought upon the person or thing baptized. In no single instance is there a dip, that is, the person or thing baptized moved, put into the baptizing element, and then immediately withdrawn.

The material for our inquiry is at hand. It will be found scattered throughout the works of the two authors just referred to. Dr. Dale has, in four large volumes, gone over the whole baptismal controversy with a thoroughness never before even attempted, and has done more than any other man to bring this matter to a final settlement. Dr. Conant's researches on this subject were undertaken at the request of the American (Baptist) Bible Union, and were undertaken for the purpose of justifying and defending the Baptists in their work of revising the New Testament, and substituting the words "immerse," "immersion," etc., in place of the words "baptize," "baptism," etc. His Greek quotations are numerous, and very fully given; we shall make free use of them. Both these authors, however, exhibit a great lack of method. They give us instances of the use of the word centuries before Christ; and side by side with these, other instances from doggerel Greek centuries after Christ, and apparently attach the same importance to all in ascertaining the meaning of the word at the time of Christ. This is confusing and utterly unscientific. Books written after the New Testament era could have had no possible influence on the import of words used

by New Testament writers. Such instances, if used at all, can only be used in a subordinate sense as illustrating and confirming the meaning already established. The only proper scientific method of ascertaining the meaning of any ancient word at a particular date, is to collate as far as possible, all the examples of the word up to that date. Then arranging these in chronological order, the careful student can determine without difficulty the import of the word in each case. While making a free use of the labors of others, the present writer claims the privilege of thinking for himself, and he enters upon this inquiry untrammelled by anything said before by friend or foe.

One more word introductory. We do not claim that *baptizo* has the same specific meaning in the New Testament that it has in the Greek of profane authors. It would be contrary to all principles of philology to argue that a word must be understood in a particular sense in the writings of Matthew or Paul, simply because that had been proved to be its accredited meaning in the writings of Pindar, Plato or Aristotle. It would, however, be equally unwarranted and unreasonable to discard the *usus loquendi* of the word prior to the New Testament era. *Baptizo* occurs in the heathen classics, and in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament including the Apocrypha. And the most eminent writers on both sides of the controversy maintain that the word, when introduced into sacred literature, does not lose its essential meaning, though it acquires a new and sacred signification. The mode and radical import are retained throughout all Greek literature.

We open Dr. Cohant's "*Baptizein*," and knowing the purpose for which it was written, and the position and character of the writer, we may safely conclude that the best possible case for the dipping theory will be made out. - And yet, what do we find? Why, this great Baptist scholar, specially employed by the Baptist Revision Committee to defend their teaching and practice,

examines 175 sentences where *baptizo* is used, and only ten of these instances does he translate by "dip," and every one of the ten is incorrectly rendered, for "dip" always takes out of the water what it puts in ; but Dr. Conant himself confesses on p. 88 that there is no "*emersion*" (that is, a taking out of the water) "in the Greek word." There is therefore no dip in the Greek word. Out of the 175 instances Dr. Conant translates 64, more than one-third of the whole, by our English words "whelm" and "overwhelm,"—words which any one can see imply that the baptizing element comes upon the subject, while the subject remains passive. This is a bad shewing for the Baptists at the outset.

But we must eliminate. Our inquiry is: How ought *baptizo* to be rendered in the New Testament. The author must therefore confine himself to instances of the use of the word prior to that time. Dr. Conant thinks he finds, perhaps, thirty occurrences of the word before the birth of Christ, and only *one* out of the thirty does he translate by "dip." That the chief Baptist scholar of America should be unable to introduce the word on which his theory hangs, only in *one* passage out of *thirty*, is a fact which may well suggest the gravest doubt as to the correctness of the theory. In reality, however, there are only twenty-seven instances, the other three being of uncertain authorship and date. These twenty-seven instances we shall carefully examine, and we shall see that there is no dip or immerse in any of them. The subject is not put into the baptizing element, but the element is moved and brought upon the subject.

The authors who use the word *baptizo* before the Christian era are Pindar (B.C. 500); Plato (B.C. 400); Alcibiades (B.C. 400); Eubulus (B.C. 380); Aristotle (B.C. 360); Septuagint (B.C. 280); Evenus of Paros (B.C. 250); Polybius (B.C. 180); Nicandar (B.C. 150); Strabo (B.C. 60); and Diodorus Siculus (B.C. 30).

Pindar uses the word once, Plato twice, Alcibiades once, Eubulus once, Aristotle once, Septuagint four times,

Evenus once, Polybius six times, Nicandar once, Strabo five times, and Diodorus Siculus four times. These twenty-seven instances are the only undoubted examples of the use of *baptizo* before the birth of Christ; and they are therefore the only known examples that could possibly have exercised any influence on the minds of the writers of the New Testament. We shall begin our examination with the first recorded use of the word, and proceed from instance to instance, in chronological order, and we shall see that instead of "every case of *baptizo* being a case of dipping" as the Baptist position demands, there is actually not a solitary instance where the word necessarily implies dipping, while in nearly all the cases that meaning is entirely inadmissible.

EXAMPLE 1.

Pindari Pyth. II. 144-147 (79, 80, ed. Boeckh).

Ἄτε γὰρ εἰνάλιον πόνον ἐχοίσας βαθὺ
σνευᾶς ἐτέρας, ἀβάπτιστός εἰμι, φελλὸς ὥς ὑπὲρ
ἔρκος, ἄλμας.

Pindar, B.C. 500 :

"For, as when the rest of the net is toiling deep in the sea, I as a cork above the net, am unbaptized by (the waves) of the sea."

Pindar, the Greek poet, here gives us the first recorded instance of *baptizo*. He is describing the impotent malice and abuse of his enemies who aspersed his fair fame, and he says in substance, I am as serene, unharmed by your raging malice and abusive epithets as a cork is above the stormy and foaming billows. The waves of malice—i.e., your abusive epithets—fall harmlessly upon me, do not overwhelm me. The first Greek baptism, then, expresses the condition of a man exposed to the foul abuse of enemies. Their haughty words bespattered him, but he was unharmed as the cork rising

with every wave. No dip here, the baptizing element is "the abuse," and it comes upon the subject.

EXAMPLE 2.

Platonis Euthyd. c. VII. (ed. Stallbaum, Vol. VI. p. 90).

Καὶ ἐγὼ γνοὺς βαπτίζομενον τὸ μεράκιον, βου-
λόμενος ἀναπαῦσαι αὐτό.

Plato, *Euthydemus*, or the Disputer, ch. VII., B.C. 400:

"And I, perceiving that the youth was baptized, wishing to give him a respite."

The word *baptizo* occurs twice in the writings of Plato, and each time it is translated "overwhelm" by such Baptist writers as Conant, A. Campbell, Gale, etc. But why render the word "overwhelm" if it means "dip, and nothing but dip in all Greek literature?" "Overwhelm" implies the baptizing element moved and brought upon the subject, while "dip" moves the subject and puts it into the baptizing element, and immediately withdraws. In the case before us the baptism expresses a condition of mental perplexity. How was this baptism effected? The boy was not poured on to the questions, but the questions were poured on to him so fast that he was confused, overwhelmed by them.

EXAMPLE 3.

Platonis Sympos. c. IV. (ed. Stallb. Vol. I. p. 25).

Καὶ γὰρ αὐτός εἰμι τῶν χθὲς βεβαπτισμένων.

Plato, *Banquet*, ch. IV., B.C. 400:

"For I myself am one of those who yesterday were baptized"—alluding to the drinking of wine.

Plato here uses the word *baptizo*, without any figure, to express the state or condition to which wine had re-

duced the man. It was a state of intoxication, and produced not by the man being put into the wine, but by the wine being put into the man. The baptizing element, not the baptized subject, was moved.

EXAMPLE 4.

Epigramma in Eupolin (*Meineke, Hist. crit. Comic. Græc. p. 119*).

βάπτες μ' ἐν θυμέλῃσιν, ἐγὼ δέ σε κίμασι πόντου
βαπτίζων ὀλέσω νάμασι πικροτέροις.

Epigram on the comic poet Eupolis. Alcibiades, B.C. 400:

"You bespattered me in your plays (i.e., with words of abuse), but I, baptizing thee with waves of the sea, will destroy thee with streams more bitter."

Dr. Conant translates "*Baptes*," "dippers," but the dippers don't go so far back in history. The *Baptae* were a leud set, so-called because they *stained* or *painted* their cheeks and parts around their eyes. Metaphorically the word meant to bespatter with billingsgate. Alcibiades was enraged because Eupolis, a comic poet, had in a play called *Baptae*, foully aspersed his character. He threatens to baptize him with waves of the sea, and destroy him with streams more bitter. "You have," he says, "aspersed me with foul words, but I will pour upon you a torrent of invective; I will pour bitterer streams of abuse upon you; as with the waves of a sea I will overwhelm you." Dr. Conant translates "immersing in waves of the sea." But the reader will observe that the Greek words "*Kumasi*" and "*namasi*" are in the dative without a preposition—the instrumental dative—which forbids such a construction. Any schoolboy knows that it must be rendered, "baptizing thee with waves of the sea,"—"will destroy thee with streams more bitter." The waves and the streams are the baptizing instrumentality, not the receptive element.

EXAMPLE 5.

Eubuli Nausicaa (*Meineke, Fragm. Comic. Græc., Vol. III. p. 238*).

Ὅς νῦν τετάρτην ἡμέραν βαπτίζεται,
νῆστιν πονήρου κεστρέως τρίβων βίον.

Eubulus (fragment of an ancient comedy), B.C. 380 :

"Who now the fourth day is baptized leading the famished life of a wretched mullet."

The mullet was a fish, notably hungry, and fabled to be always found empty when caught. There is a difference of opinion as to the meaning of this passage. Some think it is spoken of one whose vessel was wrecked and who was himself for the fourth day clinging to some part of the wrecked vessel, undergoing a slow process of starvation, and frequently baptized by the waves dashing upon him. Most scholars, including the Baptist, Dr. Fuller, think that Eubulus is here speaking of one who had been on a "drunken spree" for the four days mentioned. Then, as in Ex. 3, we know that the baptism expresses the state of intoxication, and that the liquor was the baptizing instrumentality, and that it was moved and put into the man, not the man into it. Neither interpretation lends any countenance to the dipping theory. "Four days" are too long for a Baptist dipping.

EXAMPLE 6.

Aristot. de mirabilibus Auscultat. 136 (*ed. Bekker, Vol. VI. p. 136*).

Λέγουσι τοὺς Φοινίκας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὰ Γά-
δαιρα καλούμενα, ἔξω πλέοντας Ἑρακλείων στηλῶν
ἀπηλιώτη ἀνέμῳ ἡμέρας τέτταρας, παραγίνεσθαι
εἰς τινὰς τόπους ἐρήμους, θρύου καὶ φύκους πλήρεις,
οὓς ὅταν μὲν ἄμπω τις ἢ μὴ βαπτίζεσθαι, ὅταν δὲ
πλημμύρα, κατακλύζεσθαι.

From Aristotle's "Wonderful Reports," 136, B.C. 360:

"They say that the Phœnicians, inhabiting the region called Gadir (Cadiz), sailing beyond the pillars of Hercules (the Straits of Gibraltar), with an easterly wind, four days, reach to certain desert places full of rushes and sea-weed; which, when it is ebb-tide, are not baptized; but when it is full-tide, are flooded."

This is Aristotle's famous "sea-coast baptism," and it is quite sufficient of itself to annihilate forever the "nothing but dip" theory. This greatest of Greek scholars, in the golden age of Grecian intellect, uses the word *baptizo* to express the changed condition of the sea-coast by the waves coming upon it. Here was a baptism. How was it effected? What was the mode? Was the sea-coast taken up and moved till it was put into and under the water of the sea, or did the tidal wave move and roll out upon and over the coast? Aristotle tells us that the baptizing element (the waves) came upon the baptized object (the land). The land was "baptized," but it was not dipped into, but overflowed by the rising water. Some of the ablest Baptist scholars virtually give up this case, and in so doing surrender the fort. The Baptist, Dr. Gale, for instance, was so much staggered by this passage that he says: "Besides, the word *baptizo*, perhaps, does not so necessarily express the action of putting under as, in general, a thing's being in that condition, no matter how it comes so, whether it is put into the water, or the water comes over it." What then, we ask, becomes of the time-worn Baptist standard, "dipping is baptizing, and baptizing is dipping," "a definite act," "mode and nothing but mode?" It is wholly swept away by the baptizing billows. Dr. Gale says *baptizo* expresses "condition;" so also the Baptist, Dr. Fuller. Dr. Carson, of course, does not yield an inch, but valiantly undertakes to prove that "flowing over" means "dipping into." Perhaps since sin entered into the world no man ever had a

stronger confidence in his own opinions than the "giant of Tubbermore." Dr. Conant, on page 4, falsely translates *baptizo* of this passage by "immerse," but on page 88 he correctly renders it "overflow." It avails nothing for the Baptist to say that the "sea-coast" was "covered" with the tide. The question in dispute is not the quantity of water used, but the mode of the baptism. Whether every part of the land was overflowed by the water we cannot know. The probability is that, like all other similar districts of country, the lower parts were overflowed while the higher parts were not. Yet the whole is baptized. For pungent and destructive criticism on the Baptist system, founded on this passage, the reader is referred to Dr. Dale's *Classic Baptism*, pp. 236-244.

These are all the occurrences of *baptizo* in the pure classics, beginning with Pindar (B.C. 500), and ending with Aristotle (B.C. 360), covering a period of one hundred and forty years. During all these years it always expresses state or condition as its import, while the context clearly shews affusion as the mode, the baptizing element always coming upon the subject, never the application or dipping of the subject into the baptizing element.

We now proceed to consider the four instances of *baptizo* in the Septuagint. These come next in chronological order. The Septuagint is a Greek version of the canonical books of the Old Testament, together with the Apocryphal writings of that period. It was made by seventy learned Jews in Egypt, by order of the king, about 280 B.C. Our Lord and His apostles usually quoted from it, rather than from the original Hebrew. It is therefore to be regarded as of the highest authority on all questions of New Testament language, and it throws a flood of light on the subject of our present investigation. In the Septuagint we shall find that while now, for the first time, *baptizo* is used in a religious sense, it still, as in the classics, expresses condition—

here a condition of ceremonial purification; and effected, as in the classics, by the baptizing element being moved and brought upon the subject, never the subject moved and put into the element after the manner of modern Baptists.

EXAMPLE 7.

Our next case is that of Naaman, and as it is one of considerable importance, and claimed by the Baptists as their exclusive possession, we will examine it with some degree of care. Dr. Carson says: "If there was not another passage of Scripture to throw light on the institution, as far as respects mode, is not this to every teachable mind sufficient?" But a strong statement is not always a strong argument. We give the original Hebrew of the passage as well as the Greek of the LXX.

2 KINGS 5:10, 14.

Hebrew, ver. 10:

וַיִּשְׁלַח אֵלָיו אֱלִישָׁע מִלֶּאזֶּךָ לֵאמֹר הֲלֹךְ וְרַחֲצָה שְׁבַע-
פְּעָמִים בִּירְדֵּן וְיִשָּׁב בְּשֹׂרֶךָ לֶךָ וְיִטְהַר:

Ver. 14:

וַיֵּרֶד וַיִּטְבֹּל בִּירְדֵּן שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים כַּכְדָּבָר אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים
וַיִּשָּׁב בְּשֹׂרוֹ בְּבָשָׂר גֶּר קֶטֶן וַיִּטְהַר:

Greek, ver. 10:

καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Ἐλισαῖε ἄγγελον πρὸς αὐτὸν, λέγων. πορεύσεῖς λούσαις ἑπτάνις ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ἡ σὰρξ σου σοὶ καὶ καθαρὸς θήσῃ.

Ver. 14:

καὶ κατέβη Ναιμὰν καὶ ἐβαπτίσατο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ἑπτάνις κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα Ἐλισαῖε. καὶ ἐπέστρεφεν ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ ὡς σὰρξ παιδαρίου μικροῦ, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη.

SEPTUAGINT, B.C. 280:

English, ver. 10:

"And Elisha sent a messenger unto him, saying, go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean."

Ver. 14:

"Then went he down and baptized himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God, and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean."

The question is, How did Naaman, in obedience to the man of God, baptize himself at the Jordan? I answer, he sprinkled the water upon the part affected, as the law of God required. Now for the proof. Naaman was a leper, and the prophet, being a man of God, would command him to do what the law of God required for the cleansing of the leprosy. What was that? Turn up Lev. 14:7: "He shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy *seven times*, and shall pronounce him clean." Mark carefully the important bearing on the argument, of the expression "*seven times*." Baptists tell us there was "*a bathing*" in connection with cleansing from leprosy. That is true, but as we shall show by and by, ceremonial bathing was never by plunging into water, and it was done but *once* in connection with leprosy. Naaman baptized himself *seven times*, and the law of God (Lev. 14) did not require *anything to be done seven times but the sprinkling*. Therefore Naaman's baptizing himself seven times was his sprinkling the part affected by the leprosy seven times as the law of God required. And so the first Bible baptism is clearly a baptism by sprinkling. But there are other considerations putting the mode of Naaman's baptism beyond all doubt.

In Luke 4:27, our Lord says Naaman was cleansed (*ekatharisthe*), the very word that is used in Leviticus 14 where sprinkling is distinctly mentioned as the mode.

Naaman baptized (Heb. *tabal*, Gr. *ebaptisato*) himself seven times. The scholar will observe that *tabal* is here used as the equivalent of *rachats* in verse 10—"he baptized himself seven times according to the saying of the man of God." What was that saying? "Go wash (*rachats*) in Jordan seven times," v. 10. An examination will shew that *rachats* never means "dip," but "to perform ablutions with water applied to the person." I have counted fifty-three instances of its use in the Old Testament, and after a careful examination of each, I make this statement. Take a few instances. Joseph washed (*rachats*) his face to remove the tear-marks after his weeping, Gen. 43:31. Did the great ruler of Egypt dip his face into the water for this purpose? The "elders washed (*rachats*) their hands over the heifer," Deut. 21:6. Here the Greek is *nipto*, which even Dr. Carson says, "does not mean to dip." And we know how the Jews washed their hands. "Elisha poured water on the hands of Elijah," 2 Kings 3:11. In 1 Kings 22:38, the armor of Ahab, after battle, being stained with blood, was washed (*rachats*). Must we suppose that the armor was dipped in order to wash the blood-stains from it? In Gen. 43:24; 18:4; 19:2; 24:32; Exod. 30:19, 21; 40:31; Judges 19:21; 1 Sam. 25:41; 2 Sam. 11:8, we find *rachats* in connection with feet-washing. We know the mode was to put the water upon the feet, not the feet into the water. Proof positive of this is found in Luke 7:44, "Thou gavest me no water upon my feet" (*epi podas*). Such being the import of the word *rachats*, we say without hesitation, that if Naaman dipped himself or was dipped, it was not "according to the saying of the man of God," but in express contravention of it.

Tabal, the word expressing the action of Naaman in

baptizing himself, we are told by Baptists, means "dip." And while it is not denied that it may sometimes be used in that sense, it is most positively denied that it is restricted to that narrow significance. It occurs fifteen times in the Old Testament, and according to some of the best lexicographers, such as Stokius, Schindler, Leigh, and Furstianus, the meaning of the word is exhausted, "if an object merely touches the liquid, or is touched by it." The last named scholar defines the word to *moisten*, to *sprinkle* as well as to "dip." Robert Young, LL.D., in his "Greek and Hebrew Analytical Concordance to the Bible," defines *tabal* to *moisten*, to *besprinkle*, and under these definitions he ranges all the fifteen instances of its occurrence. *Tabal* cannot mean "dip" in Gen. 37:31. It would have been physically impossible to dip (in the Baptist sense) Joseph's coat in the blood of a kid. The coat was stained or smeared with the blood. The LXX. has it "*emolunan ton kitona to haimati.*" *Moluno* means "to soil, to stain, to smear." *To haimati* is the instrumental dative, and must be rendered "with the blood." Nor can *tabal* mean a Baptist dipping in Lev. 14:15, 16, where the priest is directed to dip the finger of his right hand in a few drops of oil held in the palm of the left hand.

The case of Naaman was that of partial leprosy. This is clear from v. 11. He expected that Elisha would "wave his hand (R. V.) over the place" like the modern animal-magnetizer. It was therefore enough to ceremonially wash or baptize the part affected.

Naaman's baptism was not for a physical or medical purpose. It was not intended to cure the leprosy. God alone could cure the leprosy, just as He alone can cure sin. It was a ceremonial cleansing, symbolic of the cleansing of the leprosy, and pointing forward to the "blood of sprinkling" which cleanseth from all sin.

But why wash in the Jordan, and nowhere else? Because the cleansing of the leper, according to the law

must be by sprinkling with "running water," Lev. 14: 5, 6, 50-52. Healing to the leper meant the renewing grace of God, and for this none but the water of life that flows in the river of the heavenly Canaan will suffice. As Palestine was a type of heaven, the one river of Palestine became the proper type of that "river of God, which is full of water." It is only in the hymns that "Jordan" signifies death.

Baptists tell us that "washing" can only be by dipping, not by sprinkling. Let us see. The word "wash" simply signifies "to make clean." It is not a word of mode. In Ezek. 36: 25, the Almighty says, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you." Here, then, is a washing or cleansing by sprinkling. In Luke 7: 44, the Saviour says, "She hath washed my feet with her tears." The Syriac says, "Baptized my feet with her tears." The Psalmist in Psa. 51: 7, "Purge (Greek, sprinkle) me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." Here according to the Hebrew idiom, the word "wash" is parallel and equivalent to "purge me with hyssop." The mode is not a matter of doubt. The religious washings were not for physical cleansing, but for the purpose of symbolizing and shewing forth the cleansing (washing) of the heart by the blood of Christ (blood of sprinkling) applied by the Spirit of God. The blood of Christ, thus applied, "cleanseth from all sin," and this precious truth has ever been symbolized in the Church of God by the sprinkling of pure water. We may, therefore, safely conclude that this was the mode of Naaman's baptism.

EXAMPLE 8.

Septuag. interpret. Es. XXI. 4 (ed. Tischend.).

Ἡ ἀνομία με βαπτίζει.

Septuagint, B.C. 280, Is. 21 : 4, "Iniquity baptizes me."

The English version, adhering to the Hebrew, reads "fearfulness affrighted me." The Vulgate has "tenebræ stupefecerunt me." It is hard then to understand how this baptism can be made to express anything but condition—the condition into which one is brought by iniquity.

The only question to be settled is how was this condition effected? What was the mode of this baptism? Conant, page 84, renders "baptizes" in this passage by "whelms," a word which implies that the baptizing element comes upon the person baptized. It is evident we have here, by a figure of speech, the baptizing element put for the agent. The meaning is, "I am baptized with iniquity." What then is the mode? In reply, let it be noted that the Scriptures always speak of "iniquity" coming upon the person. In Exod. 20 : 5; 34 : 7; Num. 14 : 18; Deut. 5 : 9, we read, "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children." In 1 Sam. 25 : 24 and 2 Sam. 14 : 9, we read, "upon me let this iniquity be." In Psa. 55 : 3, we read, "they cast iniquity upon me." In Isa. 53 : 6, it is said, "the Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all." In Ezek. 4 : 4, we read, "lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it." In Num. 15 : 31, we have, "his iniquity shall be upon Him." And in Psa. 94 : 23, it is said, "He shall bring upon them their iniquity." Surely this is enough to convince even a Baptist that when the Greek says, "Iniquity baptizes me," the baptizing element is conceived of as moved and brought upon the person. And if this is so, then *delenda est immersio*.

EXAMPLE 9.*

Septuag. interpret. Judith, ch. 12, 7-9.

Καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο κατὰ νύκτα εἰς τὴν φάραγγα
Βετυλούα, καὶ ἐβαπτίζετο ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ ἐπὶ τῆς
πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος.

Καὶ ὡς ἀνέβη, ἐδέετο τοῦ Κυρίου Θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. . .
Καὶ εἰσπορευομένη καθαρά παρέμενε τῇ σκηνῇ. . . .

Septuagint, B.C. 280, Judith, ch. 12, 7-9:

"And went out nightly into the valley of Bethulia, and
baptized herself in the camp at the fountain of water.

"And as she went up, she besought of the Lord God of
Israel to direct her way to the raising up of the children of
her people.

"And entering in pure, she remained in the tent." . . .

The story of Judith is easy of access, and it is too
long to be inserted here. The town of Bethulia is in a
state of siege. The inhabitants are in great distress.
The enemy had seized upon the fountain of waters upon
which the town depended for its supply. The Jews are
about to give up in despair, when Judith, a young and
beautiful widow, appears as the deliverer. She decks
herself and goes forth to the camp of the enemy to
beguile Holofernes, the chief captain. By and by,
when he was drunk with wine, she killed him with his
own sword; and so delivered her nation. In the midst
of this story we find the word *baptizo*. Judith "went
out nightly into the valley of Bethulia and baptized
herself in the camp at the fountain of water." Let us
see if we can learn something as to the mode of this
baptism.

1. The design. Why did Judith go to the fountain?

*This and the following example are here introduced although
a later date is assigned to them by many scholars.

She went for the purpose of ceremonial purification. Hence, after her baptism we are told, verse 9, she was pure (*kathara*). This is the same word as is used in Lev. 14:7, where sprinkling is expressly mentioned as the mode. 2. The place. She baptized herself "*epi tes peges*" at (not in) *the fountain*. Of the enemies we are told, chapter vii. 3, "They encamped in the valley near Bethulia, *at the fountain*—(*epi tes peges*), the very identical words that are used to express Judith's relation to the fountain. And there is as much reason for saying that the Assyrian enemies encamped *in the fountain* as for saying that Judith dipped herself *in the fountain*. 3. All the circumstances are against the dipping theory. The fountain was near the camp, *en te parembolē*—some say *in the camp*, v. 7. It was "guarded by soldiers" (ch. vii. 7). It was the source of their supply of water for drinking purposes, chapter viii. 9. Under these circumstances, common decency would have prevented "dipping," "plunging," or "immersing" on the part of this pious woman. I cannot refrain from giving the following quotation from Dr. Dale's *Judaic Baptism*, page 358: "Dr. Carson knows that she *dipped* herself," and Dr. Fuller knows that she *bathed* herself, and Dr. Conant knows that she *immersed* herself,—where? Why, in the fountain from which the Bethulians got their drinking water, and from which 'the garrison' guarding that fountain got their water. Well, this is certainly a little remarkable, that a lady should go and 'wash her entire person' in a drinking fountain! However, these learned men say, that they know that she did it. We must, then, set down this lady, Judith, as remarkably solicitous for her own 'purification,' and remarkably regardless of the purification of the waters for those who drank after her nightly washings!"

Conant, page 85, says that she "went to the fountain in order to get water deep enough for immersion." But unfortunately for that statement, the record, chapter xii. 6, tells us that she went out for prayer, not for baptism

of any kind. For the purpose of purification she required water free from heathenish pollution, chapter xii. 1, 2. And may it not be that her going "out of the camp every night" was a part of her plan by which she was to escape after the assassination of Holofernes?

EXAMPLE 10.

Septuag. lib. Siracidæ c. 34: 27 (*ed. Tischend.*).

Βαπτίζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ καὶ πάλιν ἀπιόμενος αὐτοῦ, τί ὠφέλησε τῷ λουτρῷ αὐτοῦ;

Septuagint, B.C. 280:

"He that is baptized from a dead body, and touching it again, what is he benefited by his washing."

"Baptized from a dead body" means purified from the uncleanness contracted by touching a dead body. From Num. 19: 11-13, we learn that this purification was effected by sprinkling the ashes of a heifer. Verse 13 reads, "Whosoever touches the dead body of any one that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel, because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean, his uncleanness is yet upon him." This baptism, then, was a condition of purification, and there is no doubt as to the mode in which it was effected. God's word says it was by sprinkling.

But does not the Bible say that the man must "bathe himself in water?" Yes, our English version says that, but the Greek says, "*Kai lousetai hudati.*" "*Hudati*" is the "dative instrumental," and should be rendered "wash with water," not "bathe in water." This expression "*lousetai hudati*" occurs sixteen times in Lev. 15 and 16. The preposition "en" before "*hudati*" is of rare occurrence. The self-washings are never called purifyings, nor referred to by that name. The purifyings (here called baptism) were all by sprinkling.

Paul says (Heb. 9: 13, R.V.) that "the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify to the cleanness of the flesh." He says not a word about the washing of clothes, or "cleansing with water after the baptism." Josephus (Antiq. Bk. 4, ch. 4, sec. 6) tells us that persons defiled by touching a dead body, were sprinkled with water mixed with heifer ashes on the third day and seventh day, and after that they were clean. (See page 52.) This state of ceremonial purification, effected by sprinkling, Paul (Heb. 9:10) calls "*diaforoi baptismoi*" (divers baptisms), and Sirach here calls it a baptism.

We have now traced *baptizo* through the classic and Hellenistic Greek, covering a period of about 220 years, yet the word never occurs meaning "to dip" or "to immerse." The baptizing elements are varied—wine, questions, iniquity, water—but whatever the element, it is always applied to the subject. Our next example is from Evenus of Paros.

EXAMPLE 11.

Eveni Parii et al. Epigr. XV.

Βαπτίζει δ' ὕπνῳ γείτονι τοῦ θανάτου.

Evenus of Paros, Epigram XV., B.C. 250:

"Baptizes with sleep, neighbor of death."

Evenus says of Bacchus (the use of wine), when too freely indulged in, that he "baptizes with sleep, neighbor of death." Dr. Conant, p. 58, translates, "plunges in sleep, neighbor of death." But there is no "in sleep" in the Greek. Evenus has "*hupno*," the dative instrumental without any preposition. We have a similar use of the word in Luke 9: 32, "But Peter and those with him were heavy with sleep (*hupno*). Sleep is here the baptizing element, and in all literature sleep is represented as coming upon the person. Here are a few

Scripture examples: Gen. 2: 21, "A deep sleep to fall upon Adam;" Gen. 15: 12, "A deep sleep fell upon Abram;" 1 Sam. 26: 12, "A deep sleep from the Lord was fallen upon them;" Job 4: 13, "When deep sleep falleth on men;" Isa. 29: 10, "For the Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep." These are sufficient to show that in baptism by sleep, the baptizing element is conceived as coming upon the person baptized. Evenus does not depart from the uniform usage of the word up to his time.

Following our chronological order, we now come to the consideration of six instances of baptism in the writings of Polybius (B.C. 180). Here we first meet with "ship baptisms," and as there are several of them ahead of us, a few words of a general character may be helpful to a better understanding of them. Baptists contend that the act of sinking is the baptism. But the action of a vessel already in the water, sinking to the bottom of the ocean and remaining there for all time, is an entirely distinct act from the dipping of modern Baptists. Were they to baptize their candidates as they say these ships were baptized, they would drown all entrants into their church. Our position is that the baptism expresses the changed condition of the ship, and is effected by some element or influence coming upon the thing baptized. Besides, it cannot be shewn that any of the vessels baptized were actually sunk; while we are expressly told that some of them were not sunk. Time and again we have in Greek literature a sharp contrast between baptism and sinking. Take a few illustrations. Here is one from the "Life of Pythagoras," sec. 2. The Greek reads,

Το μέντοι βαπτίζομένην τὴν ναῦν παρ' ἐλπίδα σωθῆναι, προνοίας θεοῦ.

"And that the baptized ship beyond all hope is saved, is of the providence of God."

Here the ship is "baptized beyond all hope" by the waves lashing over it, and still it was not under the water, for if it had it could not have been saved.

Another instance of ship baptism without sinking we have in Heliodorus *Æthiopics*, Book 5. It is Conant, 39.

"Ἡδη δὲ βαπτιζομένων καὶ καταδύναι μικρὸν ἀπολειπόντων.

"And already becoming baptized and wanting little of sinking."

Render this Baptist fashion, "And already becoming dipped and wanting little of dipping!" What beautiful sense! And yet we are told with the confidence of assumed infallibility that *baptizo* always means "to dip," and that dip and sink are synonymous terms. If *baptizo* means a "covering with water," as one Baptist writer says; or "lying under water," as another assures us, how, I ask, did not this ship go to the bottom as all vessels do when they go clean under the water?

This reminds us of another baptism without "possibility of sinking." It is not a ship baptism this time. It is Conant, 24, and from Plutarch, A.D. 50:

Ἀσκὸς βαπτίζῃ· δύναι δέ τοι οὐ θέμις ἐστίν.

"A bladder, thou mayest be baptized but it is not possible for thee to sink."

Athens might be occasionally overwhelmed with calamities but she would recover from them. In this instance two things are affirmed: the inflated bladder, buoyantly floating upon the water, *could not possibly sink*. It was, however, baptized by the drenching spray cast upon it by the waves.

Let us see if we can ascertain something of the mode

of ship baptisms. Josephus, A.D. 70 (Jewish Wars, Bk. 3, ch. 9, sec. 3), says :

Μετέωρος ὑπεραρθεῖς ὁ κλυδὸν ἐβάπτισεν.

"The billow rising high above baptized" (many of the vessels and men).

Here the context shews that the vessels and men baptized were not sunk. The baptism was the condition into which they were brought, and the mode was by the baptizing elements (the billows) coming upon the subjects. Josephus wrote about A.D. 70, and consequently his testimony should have some weight in determining the usage of this word in the New Testament.

An illustration of the mode of Greek baptism we have in Conant, Example 88. Libanius, Epistle 25, speaking of an earthquake in which two of his friends had perished, says :

Καὶ αὐτός εἰμι τῶν βεβαπτισμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου κύματος ἐκείνου.

"I myself am one of those baptized by that great wave."

The wave came upon him. He was not put into it, nor did he sink. It is evident that among the Greeks, ships lashed by the waves were "baptized;" and it is just as evident that these ships were not necessarily sunk or destroyed.

A few words as to the authority of the lexicons will here be in place. Dr. Carson frankly confesses (p. 55) that "all the lexicographers are against the Baptist theory." He might have gone further and acknowledged that there is not on earth a lexicon of the Greek language that gives "dip," "plunge," or "immerse" as the *New Testament meaning of baptizo*. There are dictionaries or vocabularies or glossaries of the New Testament prepared for denominational purposes, and, of course, fur-

nishing definitions to suit the demand, but these are not Greek lexicons. Some lexicographers, however, imagine they find immersion in the later Greek classics. And this need not surprise anyone. The early lexicographers were all Catholics. These were Budæus (A.D. 1519), H. Stephanus (A.D. 1572), and Scapula (A.D. 1579). It is well known that for over a thousand years the Catholic Church practised trine-immersion—"three dips for one baptism." When therefore these early lexicographers found *baptizo* in the writings of Polybius, Strabo, Diodorus, etc., they looked at it in the light of the theory and practice of their Church for centuries, and gave the current rather than the classic meaning of the word. Later lexicographers, as anyone can see for himself, slavishly copy from these earlier ones. Hence the "dip," "plunge," "immerse," "dip repeatedly" of most lexicons. Where did they get the "repeatedly?" The answer to that question is very significant, as proving the Romish origin of dipping for baptism. Lexicographers got the "repeatedly" just where they got the "dip," in the trine or threefold immersions of the Greek and Latin churches. No Baptist will say that in the New Testament or before it, *baptizo* ever meant "to dip repeatedly." The "repeatedly" is the patent mark put upon the "dip" to indicate its origin and ownership.

A word on "Liddell and Scott," our popular school lexicon. "Of late this lexicon has been completely manipulated by Immersionists. Yet it does not sustain them, for the simple reason that their theory is so unscientific and absurd it cannot be sustained." They first define *baptizo* "to dip repeatedly, dip under;" second, they erase the second part, and put it "dip repeatedly;" then they change again and give "*wet, pour upon.*" By and by there is another change made, and "immerse" is inserted,—a word not found in any previous edition. And so they go on changing and re-changing their lexicon on this word—at least eleven changes on one word! They have not so tampered with the defini-

tion of any other word. Prof. Drisler, the American editor of "Liddell and Scott," over his own signature, says "changes were made in relation to the article *baptizo*, which I never saw." It is a well known fact that Dr. Duncan, editor of the *Baptist Chronicle*, stole a march upon the unsuspecting editor of the lexicon, and so mutilated the book while it was passing through the press as to favor dipping. Still "Liddell and Scott" have not yet ventured to gratify Baptist demands so far as to give "dip" or "immerse" as a *New Testament* meaning of *baptizo*. But no one who knows their repeated and whimsical changes, and consequently their acknowledged blundering on this word, will attach any importance to what they may say on the subject. For a full history of how the Baptists have manipulated this lexicon to suit their own purpose, the reader is referred to Dr. Ditzler, p. 155, note; and to "*Baptisma*," by Rev. John Lathern, p. 173.

We are now prepared to go on with our examples.

EXAMPLE 12.

Polybii Hist. lib. I. c. 51, 6.

Ἐμβολὰς τε συνεχεῖς ἐδίδοσαν, καὶ πολλὰ τῶν σκαφῶν ἐβάπτιζον.

Polybius, History, bk. I. ch. 51, 6, B.C. 180:

"They made continued assaults and baptized many of the vessels."

Polybius here tells us that in a sea-fight the Carthaginians assaulted the Roman vessels and "baptized" many of them. There is no evidence that the vessels were sunk. But even if they were, that act is quite distinct from a Baptist dipping. The vessels remained for all time at the bottom. The baptism was not any act of sinking, but the changed condition of the vessels, and the baptizing instrumentality (the assaults) came upon the vessels.

EXAMPLE 13.

Polybii Hist. lib. VIII. c. 8, 4 (*ed. Schweigh.*).

Οὐ γενόμενου, τινὰ μὲν τῶν πλοίων πλάγια κατέπιπτε, τινὰ δὲ καὶ κατεστρέφετο· τὰ δὲ πλεῖστα τῆς πλώρας ἀφ' ὕψους ριφθείσης βαπτιζόμενα, πλήρη θαλάττης ἐγίγνετο καὶ ταραχῆς.

Polybius, History, bk. VIII. ch. 8, 4, B.C. 180:

"Which, being done, some of the vessels fell on their side, and some were overturned; but most of them, when the prow was let fall from on high, being baptized, became filled with sea-water and confusion."

Polybius says these ships were baptized. But what was the baptism? Was it "the act of sinking?" We have no evidence that these ships went under the water, but the contrary. If they were under the water who could see the "confusion?" "But," says the Baptist, "they were filled with sea-water." No doubt of it, but that does not say nor imply that they were under the water. Read Mark 4: 37, 38, "And there arose a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the ship so that *it was now full*. And he was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow." Luke 8: 23, "And there came down a storm of wind on the lake, and *they were filled with water*, and were in jeopardy." In these verses we have described the precise condition of the ships that Polybius says were baptized. But these ships were not under the surface of the sea, though the water had lashed profusely over them.

EXAMPLE 14.

Polybii Hist. lib. XVI. c. 6, 2.

τετρῶμενην καὶ βαπτιζομένην ὑπὸ νεῶς πολεμίας.

Polybius, History, bk. XVI. ch. 6, 2, B.C. 180:

"Pierced and being baptized by a hostile ship."

Polybius is here speaking of a ship of Attalus, in a sea-fight with Philip. Evidently the "baptism" expresses the "condition" of the injured vessel, not the "act of sinking." There is no evidence that there was any sinking, and we have shewn under Example 13 that the Greeks sharply contrasted baptism with "submersion." The baptizing instrumentality is the "hostile ship."

EXAMPLE 15.

Polybii Hist. lib. III. c. 72, 4.

μόλις, ἕως τῶν μαστῶν οἱ πεζοὶ βαπτίζόμενοι, διέβαινον.

Polybius, History, bk. III. ch. 72, 4, B.C. 180:

"They passed through with difficulty, the foot soldiers baptized up to the breasts."

Polybius is speaking of the passage of the Roman army through the river Tebia when it was swollen by heavy rains. Any intelligent person can see that *baptizo* here does not express "act" but "condition." It does not put the Roman soldiers "into the water" or take them "out of the water," but it expresses the "condition" in which they found themselves with the waters of the swollen river rushing upon them.

EXAMPLE 16.

Polybii Hist. lib. V. c. 47, 2 (*ed. Schweigh.*).

Οἱ καὶ συνεγγίσαντες τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ξενοίταν, διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τῶν τόπων οὐ προσεδέοντο τῶν πολεμίων· αὐτοὶ δ' ὑπ' αὐτῶν βαπτίζόμενοι καὶ καταδύνοντες ἐν τοῖς τέλμασιν, ἄχρηστοι μὲν ἦσαν ἅπαντες, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ διεφθάρησαν αὐτῶν.

Polybius, History, bk. V. ch. 47, 2, B.C. 180:

"Who, coming into near proximity with the forces of Xenætas, through ignorance of the localities required no enemy, but themselves by themselves baptized and sinking in the pools were all useless, and many of them also perished."

Polybius is describing the condition of a body of cavalry sent by Molon to attack Xencetas in a place where he was protected by the river Tigris, and by marshes and pools. The soldiers were ignorant of the route, and got into the swampy places. Hence the baptism, and worse, the "perishing." Observe the clear distinction between the "baptism" and the "sinking in the pools." They were all baptized but only "many of them" sank into the pools and perished. Those who mired down in the swamps perished, while those "baptized by themselves" were so bespattered with mud and water by the rearing and plunging of the horses, that they were "useless" or unfit for service—not an uncommon experience of military men.

EXAMPLE 17.

Polybii Reliq. lib. XXXIV. c. 3, 7 (ed. Schweigh. Vol. IV. p. 626).

Κᾶν ἐκπέσῃ δὲ εἰς τὴν θάλατταν τὸ δόρυ, οὐκ ἀπό-
λωλεν· ἔστι γὰρ πηκτὸν ἐν τε δρυὸς καὶ ἐλάτης,
ὥστε, βαπτιζομένου τοῦ δρυϊνοῦ βάρει, μετέωρον
εἶναι τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ εὐανάληπτον.

Polybius, History, bk. XXXIV. ch. 3, 7, B.C. 180:

"Even if the spear falls into the sea, it is not lost; for it is constructed of both oak and pine; so that when the oaken part is baptized by the weight, the rest is floating and easily recovered."

I give this as an example from Polybius, but the authorship is extremely doubtful. Conant gives it as from Book 34 of Polybius' History. But Anthon, in his Classical Dictionary, Art. Polybius, informs us that only five of the books of Polybius are extant, and that all after Book 17 are irrecoverably lost. An extract, therefore, from "Book 34" is not worth much. The case,

however, presents no special difficulty. The writer, whoever he may be, is describing the manner of catching the sword-fish with a harpoon. Anyone can see that the baptism expresses not the "act" of putting the spear into the water, nor the "act" of taking it out, but the condition of a part of the spear. Observe "*barei*" (weight) is in the dative case as the baptizing instrumentality. This is a baptism by "weight," not by water. Polybius writes in a much coarser style of Greek than his classic predecessors, but he does not depart from the classic usage of *baptizo*—it is always condition, and condition effected by the baptizing element coming upon the subject.

EXAMPLE 18.

Nicandri Georg. II.

Δριμείη πολέας ἐμβάπτισον ἄλμη

Nicander, B.C. 150:

"Baptize many together with sharp brine."

This is from a work on husbandry by Nicander (B.C. 150). The author is giving directions how to make pickles, and part of his direction is as above, "baptize many together with sharp brine." Conant, on page 74, translates it, "immerse many together in sharp brine." But this is ignoring grammar to save the theory. There is no "in brine" in the Greek. The student will observe that "*halme*" (brine) is in the dative without a preposition—the dative instrumental—and cannot be rendered "in brine" as the receptive element. Besides, rather than part with his dipping, Conant ignores universal usage. Every housewife knows that in making pickles the vegetables are put, "many together," into the vessel first, and then the "sharp brine" is poured over them. Nicander gives us a Greek baptism by pouring.

EXAMPLE 19.

Strabonis Geogr. lib. XII. c. 2, 4 (*ed. Tzschucke*).

Τῷ δὲ καθιέντι ἀκόντιον ἄνωθεν εἰς τὸν βόθρον ἢ βία τοῦ ὕδατος ἀντιπράττει τοσοῦτον ὥστε μόλις βαπτίζεσθαι.

Strabo, Geography, bk. XII. ch. 2, 4, B.C. 60:

"And to one who hurls down a dart, from above into the channel, the force of the water makes so much resistance, that it is hardly baptized."

This is from Strabo, and there is nothing in it to show that *baptizo* expresses motion or mode of action. The motion is expressed by the word "*Kathienti*." The baptism of the dart is not a "dipping" for it remained in the water. Here, as in our other examples, baptism expresses not a definite action but a definite condition.

EXAMPLE 20.

Strabo. lib. XIV. c. 3, 9 (*ed. Tzschucke*).

Ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος εἰς χιμέριον ἐμπεσὼν καιρὸν καὶ τὸ πλεον ἐπιτρέπων τῇ τύχῃ πρὶν ἀνεῖναι τὸ κῦμα ὥρμησε, καὶ ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ὕδατι γενέσθαι τὴν πορείαν συνέβη μέχρι ὀμφαλοῦ βαπτιζομένων.

Strabo, bk. XIV. ch. 3, 9, B.C. 60:

"Alexander happening to be there at the stormy season, and trusting commonly to fortune, set forward before the storm abated; and they marched the whole day in the water—they being baptized to the waist."

What exploding dynamite is to a lot of rubbish heaped over it, this instance is to the dipping theory. To talk of men walking through the water all day as being dipped in the modern Baptist sense, is simply an absurd

use of language, and shows the desperate straits to which the friends of "the theory" are reduced. Observe that in the sentence, the use of *baptizo* is preceded by an account of the troops being already in the water, so that *baptizo* did not put them into the water, neither did it take them out of the water, but it expresses the condition in which the soldiers found themselves during "the whole day." "A whole day" is too long for a Baptist dipping. This has been called "a baptism by marching" and "a baptism by wading;" more correctly, it is a "baptism by wetting." In ordinary weather, the beach, over which the soldiers marched, was dry ground, but we are told a storm was raging at the time, and the soldiers were "baptized as far as the waist," by the storm-lashed waves coming upon them.

EXAMPLE 21.

Strabonis, lib. VI. 2, 9 (*Siebenkees*).

Περὶ Ἀκράγαντα δὲ λίμναι τὴν μὲν γεῦσιν ἔχουσαι θαλάττης, τὴν δὲ φύσιν διάφορον· οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῖς ἀκολύμβοις βαπτίζεσθαι συμβαίνει ξύλων τρόπον ἐπιπολάζουσιν.

Strabo, bk. VI. ch. 2, 9, B.C. 60:

"And around Acragas (Agrigentum in Sicily) are marsh-lakes, having the taste indeed of sea-water, but a different nature; for even those who cannot swim are not baptized, floating like pieces of wood."

Here, as in our last example, *baptizo* does not put the subjects into the water—it does not dip or plunge them—they were in the water already, "swimming." But it expresses very emphatically "a new state of life or experience," the secondary meaning which Dr. Conant, on page 159, gives to *baptizo*, but of which, strange to say, in all Greek literature he seems never to have found an instance. The more the pity. "A new state"—why

that expresses not a modal act, but a changed condition, and every instance of the word we have yet examined is an illustration of it. But Dr. Conant has his theory of "putting into or under water" to defend, and if all Greek literature is against him, so much the worse for Greek literature. He is like Admiral Nelson at the battle of Copenhagen, who, when informed that the battle was going against him, and that the signal for retreat was hoisted, raised the telescope to his blind eye and said, "I cannot see it." Some men have a blind eye with which to look at what they don't want to see.

EXAMPLE 22.

Strabonis, lib. XVI. c. 2, 42.

Εἴτ' ἐπιπολάζουσα διὰ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ ὕδατος, καθ' ἣν ἔφαμεν μηδὲ κολύμβου δεῖσθαι, μηδὲ βαπτίζεσθαι τὸν ἐμβάντα ἀλλ' ἐξαίρεσθαι.

Strabo, bk. XVI. ch. 2, 42, B.C. 60:

"Then floating at the top on account of the nature of the water, by virtue of which, we said, there is no need of being a swimmer, and he who enters is not baptized, but is lifted out."

This is Conant's translation. Observe that *baptizo* does not put into the water—that action is expressed by "*embanta*"—nor does *baptizo* lift out of the water—that action is expressed by "*exairesthai*." But a "lifting out of the water" is a necessary part of every Baptist dipping, and they tell us it is a part of the divine command, and a type of the resurrection. That is, "*emersion*" (taking out of the water) which Dr. Conant, page 88, confesses "is not included in the meaning of the Greek word," is a part of the divine command, and a type of the resurrection! When will men cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?

EXAMPLE 23.

Strabonis Geogr. lib. XII. c. 6, 4 (ed. Tzschucke).

Οὕτω δὲ περιπύττεται ῥαδίως τὸ ὕδωρ παντὶ τῷ βαπτισθέντι εἰς αὐτὸ ὥστε στεφάνους ἁλῶν ἀνέλκουσιν, ἐπειδὴν καθῶσι κύκλον σχοίνινον.

Strabo, bk. XII. ch. 6, 4, B.C. 60:

"The water solidifies so readily around everything that is baptized into it, that they draw up salt-crowns when they let down a circle of rushes."

Strabo is speaking of the lake Tatta, in Phrygia (which he calls a natural salt-pit). Much importance is attached by Immersionists to this passage because of the preposition "*eis*" (into) with *baptizo*. It may be observed that this is a very rare construction, though *eis* is frequently used with *bapto*, to dip. In the Scriptures *baptizo* is never used in connection with the phrase *eis hudor* (into water). One page 245 of "Classic Baptism," Dr. Dale shews that the use of *eis* in such passages does not prove that *baptizo* expresses *motion*, but simply a change into another state of existence. "In any case of baptism," says Dr. Dale, "the baptized object passes out of one position or condition into another." Josephus (Antiq. Bk. 10, ch. 9, sec. 4) says:

βεβαπτισμενον εἰς ἀναισθησίαν καὶ ὕπνον ὑπὸ τῆς μέθης.

"Baptized *into* insensibility and sleep by drunkenness."

Does that imply modal action in *baptizo*? Clement of Rome says, "The feast passing into drunkenness," meaning, as anyone can see, not motion, but a changed condition. In the New Testament we have baptism "*eis*" (into) Moses—baptism "*eis*" (into) Christ—baptism "*eis*" (into) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Not merely "in the name," but

"into the name," as every scholar must admit. But in none of these cases will it be claimed that "*eis*" gives modal action to *baptizo*, but simply a change into another state or condition. Dr. Dale illustrates by the English word "bury." It is certainly a non-modal word, and yet we say "he buried the ball into the wood." In the example from Strabo the motion into the water is expressed by "*kathosi*" (let down); the motion out of the water is expressed by "*anelkousin*" (draw up), while the changed condition is expressed by "*baptisthenti*." There is a "dip" in this passage, but even Dr. Carson, were he to rise from the dead, could not find it in the word *baptizo*. The baptizing instrumentality in this case was not the water, but the particles of salt which accumulated around the circle of rushes producing "salt-crowns."

We now come to Diodorus Siculus, and in his writings we find *baptizo* occurring four times.

EXAMPLE 24.

Diodori Siculi Biblioth. Hist, lib. XVI. c. 80 (ed. Bekker).

Ὁ ποταμὸς βιαιοτέρῳ τῷ ρεύματι καταφερόμενος πολλοὺς ἐβάπτισε, καὶ μετὰ τῶν ὅπλων διανηχομένους διέφθειρε.

Diodorus, bk. XVI. ch. 80, B.C. 30:

"The river, rushing down with a more violent current, baptized many, and destroyed them swimming through with their armor."

Diodorus is here speaking of the defeat of the Carthaginian army. The fleeing soldiers were driven into a river swollen by a recent storm, and the water "rushing down" upon them baptized them. Here, then, is a Greek baptism, only thirty years before the time of our Lord. What was the mode? The most perverse ingenuity, by any amount of philological torture, cannot extort from this passage a confession in favor of dipping. We are distinctly told the swollen river "rushed down" upon

the soldiers. The baptizing element was moved, not the baptized persons.

EXAMPLE 25.

Diodori lib. I. ch. 36.

Τῶν δὲ χειρσαίων θηρίων τὰ πολλὰ μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ περιληφθέντα διαφθείρεται βαπτιζόμενα, τινὰ δ' εἰς τοὺς μετεώρους ἐκφεύγοντα τόπους διασώζεται.

Diodorus, bk. I. ch. 36, B.C. 30:

"Many of the wild animals, overtaken by the river, perish, being baptized; but some, escaping to the grounds, are saved."

The author is describing the sudden overflow of the Nile, and consequently the extensive destruction of cattle. What was the mode of this baptism? Are the waters, in this case, formed into a sort of inland sea, or vast baptistery, and then the herds of wild animals brought and dipped into and under those waters? Nonsense. The animals are browsing upon the pasture ground; the flood of waters rushes upon them with irresistible force, a few narrowly effect their escape, but most of them are overwhelmed and perish. Baptists put their subjects into the water, Diodorus brought the waters upon the subjects.

EXAMPLE 26.

Diodori lib. XI. c. 18.

Ὁ δὲ ναύαρχος προηγούμενος τῆς τάξεως καὶ πρῶτος συνάφας μάχην διεφθάρη, λαμπρῶς ἀγωνισάμενος· τῆς δὲ νεῶς βαπτισθείσης, ταραχὴ κατέσχε τὸ ναυτικὸν τῶν βαρβάρων.

Diodorus, Historical Library, bk. XI. ch. 18, B.C. 30:

"The commander of the fleet, leading on the line, and first joining battle, was slain after a brilliant conflict; and his ship being baptized, confusion seized the fleet of the barbarians."

This is said of the Persian fleet at the battle of Salamis. The injury received by the ships is here called a baptism. And the mode is evident. The assaults of the enemy upon the ships constituted the baptizing instrumentality.

EXAMPLE 27.

Diodori Siculi Biblioth. Hist. lib. I. c. 73 (*ed. Bekker*).

Τὴν δὲ δευτέραν μοῖραν οἱ βασιλεῖς παρειλήφασιν εἰς προσόδους . . . τοὺς δὲ ιδιώτας διὰ τὴν ἐν τούτων εὐπορίαν, οὐ βαπτίζουσι ταῖς εἰσφοραῖς.

Diodorus, bk. I., ch. 73, B.C. 30:

"The second part the kings have received for public revenue; . . . and on account of the abundant supply of these, they do not baptize the common people with taxes."

Once more we ask what was the thing moved in this baptism—the persons baptized or the baptizing instrumentality? Even Conant renders by "whelm with taxes," a word which implies that the taxes, that is, the baptizing instrumentality, come upon the people. Observe "*eisforais*" (taxes) is in the dative without a preposition, and demands this construction.

THE WHOLE SUMMED UP.

We have now examined all the known and undoubted instances of *baptizo* from the earliest recorded occurrence, in Pindar, B.C. 500, up to the time of our Lord. We have endeavored to deduce the import of the word, not from the contradictory testimony of lexicons, or from the careless and ignorant concessions of scholars, who, however erudite on some other subjects, knew little and cared less about the mode or meaning of baptism, but from the actual use of the word.

We have made our reference directly to the original passages in which the word occurs, in both sacred and profane literature. The *usus loquendi* of a word is the supreme court of appeal by which any proposed meaning must ultimately stand or fall. A lexicon definition, or a learned man's opinion is absolutely worthless unless it is sustained by the occurrence of the term. The instances we have examined shew a great variety of meanings, but all expressing a changed state of condition, never once mode of action, such as "dip," "plunge" or "immerse." Where the context is given, or the surrounding circumstances, a little examination shews that the baptizing element is moved and brought upon the person or thing baptized. In the pure classics the youth in a condition of mental perplexity is a baptized youth; the man in a condition of drunkenness is a baptized man; the coast in a condition of being overflowed is a baptized coast. There was a different state or condition each time, but all were classic Greek baptisms. And as to the mode, there was no dip in effecting these baptisms. In the one case the baptizing instrumentality was the questions; in the other, the wine; and in the last, the waves. But the youth was not put into the questions, the questions were put to him; the man was not plunged into the wine, the wine was put into him; the coast was not taken up and dipped into the sea, the sea came upon the coast.

In the Septuagint we, for the first time, find the word used to express the condition of religious purity. The person in a condition of purification from leprosy is a baptized person; the person in a condition of purification from the touch of a dead body is a baptized person, and the person in a condition of purification from association with heathen Gentiles is a baptized person. And here, as in the older classics, the baptizing element uniformly comes upon the subject.

In later Greek, the man in the condition of being overcome by sleep, is a baptized man; the ship in the

le of Salamis.
led a baptism.
of the enemy
instrumentality.

d. Bekker).

αρειλήφασιν
τὴν ἐκ τοῦ-
ραῖς.

ed for public
ant supply of
ith taxes."

oved in this
izing instru-
with taxes,"
the baptiz-
e. Observe
t a preposi-

undoubted
occurrence,
Lord. We
the word,
ons, or from
nolars, who,
v little and
aptism, but

condition of being attacked by enemies or lashed by the wild waves, is a baptized ship; the soldiers exposed to the rushing waters are baptized; the people overwhelmed with taxes are baptized; the vegetables made into pickles are baptized. And in each case the baptizing element comes upon the subject. The sleep comes upon the man; the waves and the assaults come upon the ships; the waters come upon the soldiers; the taxes are imposed upon the people, and the brine is poured upon the vegetables.

There is no dipping in the Greek, secular or sacred, prior to the Christian era. Classic Greek says it is not in me; Hellenistic Greek says it is not in me; and later Greek says it is not in me. If any Baptist denies this, we demand in support of his denial, not scraps of "opinions," or ignorant concessions, or mutilated quotations, but the actual instance of the word. We remind him also that his position demands not one instance merely, but every instance, without one exception, to be an instance of dipping. It is impossible, however, to find one. Baptists make *baptizo* express a definite act, the Greeks made it express a definite condition; Baptists put the subject into the water, the Greeks uniformly brought the water upon the subject.

Our argument is inductive, and our conclusion is co-extensive with our premises. We examine carefully each instance of the occurrence of the word, and we predicate of the whole what we have proved true of each case; and our conclusion is that there is no sentence in Greek literature, prior to the time of Christ, where any kind of baptism is effected by the person or thing baptized being applied to the baptizing element. The baptizing element is uniformly represented as being applied to the person or thing baptized. There is, therefore, no "dipping" for baptism up to this time. Baptism, in the classics, is always a word of power, indicating a changed state or condition; and never do we find that changed state or condition brought about after the manner of the modern Baptists.

MODE AND MEANING IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

When we come to the New Testament, we find *baptizo* occurring about eighty times, *baptisma* some twenty times, and *baptismos* ⁺ *mes*. But in the words of Dr. Charles Hodge, America's greatest theologian, "so far as the New Testament is concerned, there is not a single case where baptism necessarily implies immersion." (Systematic Theology, Vol. III., p. 536.) Not one instance, or command, or metaphor, or even an allusion do we find that can be logically construed into a sanction of "dipping." In the Scriptures the word is used as indicating an effect infinitely grander, nobler, more powerful than any water-dipping. Here, just as in the classics, the word is non-modal; but while in the classics the effect indicated is usually of a bad, low, or destructive nature, in the New Testament it has a nobler, a consecrated, a spiritualized meaning. Look at some of the instances. The apostles were baptized with the Spirit, when their condition was completely changed by the Spirit of God. They were baptized with fire, when by that purifying element, their dross was purged away, and they were brought into a new state of mind, spake with tongues of fire and became red-hot men. Paul tells us (1 Cor. 10: 2) that the children of Israel were baptized, when passing "on dry ground" (Ex. 14: 16-22) through the sea. They could not have been dipped or immersed "on dry ground." They were brought out of a condition of distrust and rebellion into a condition of complete submission to God and His servant, Moses; so we read (Ex. 14: 31), "*Then the people feared the Lord and believed the Lord, and His servant, Moses.*" Noah and his family were baptized in the ark (1 Peter 3: 20, 21), when the wickedness which threatened to sweep them away was removed, and they were anew consecrated in covenant to God--their condition changed. Our Lord Jesus Christ was baptized with His sufferings (Luke 12: 50), when His state or condition

was changed, by His being made perfect through suffering (Heb. 2: 10). Every believer is baptized with the Spirit, that is, his powers and faculties are brought under the purifying, sanctifying influence of the Spirit. We are baptized with water, when we are symbolically brought into this changed state towards God. Water itself does not effect the change, but shews it forth, or makes it manifest. Baptism with water symbolizes that state or condition of spiritual purity effected in the soul by the Holy Ghost applying to the soul the cleansing blood of Christ, which is the "blood of sprinkling" (Heb. 12: 24. 1 Peter 1: 2). 1 Cor. 12: 13 tells us what?—that the one baptism of Eph. 4: 5 is the baptism by "one Spirit." Water baptism is only the sign or symbol of that one baptism. I crave the reader's close attention to this point. A clear apprehension of the distinction between the Spirit or real baptism, and water or symbol baptism, would save from the grave errors into which Baptists, Campbellites, Dunkards, Christadelphians and other immersionist sects have fallen. In the Scriptures we find "one circumcision" (Rom. 2: 28, 29), and "one *sign or symbol* of circumcision" (Rom. 4: 11); one Passover (1 Cor. 5: 7), and one sign or symbol of the Passover (Ex. 12); one real supper, spiritual in its nature (John 6: 53, 54), and one symbol supper—of bread and wine, symbols of His body and blood. So there is "one baptism" (Eph. 4: 5 and 1 Cor. 12, 13), and one symbol of baptism, that administered with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And our position is that both in symbol, and in real baptism the baptizing element or agency always comes upon the person. The Scripture represents man as the passive recipient, and the Holy Ghost as the agent ever active in applying to the soul the blessings of redemption. But the immersion theory reverses this by representing man as the active agent, and the Holy Ghost as merely the passive recipient of those baptized not by Him but within Him.

Let us open our Bibles and hear what the Lord saith. as to the mode of baptism. The apostles were baptized with the Holy Ghost (Acts 1:5), and the Spirit was "poured out" on them (Acts 2:16, 17-33); they were baptized with fire (Matt. 3:7), and a tongue of fire came down and "sat upon each of them." Three thousand receive water baptism during the few closing hours of a single day, and in a city where there was no place that opposing and dominant Jews would permit to be used for immersion. Paul was baptized in his own room (Acts 9:17, 18), where he could not have been immersed. The inspired record says "*anastas ebaptisthe*," having stood up he was baptized. The jailer of Philippi was converted in the jail, at the midnight hour, and we are told that there "he was baptized, he and all his *straightway*" (Acts 16:33). No immersion here. Cornelius and his household having had the Spirit *poured out* upon them, water was brought and poured out upon them as an emblem of this spiritual baptism (Acts 10:47, 48. See Alford *in loc*). The children of Israel were baptized with or by the cloud as the symbol of their baptism by the Spirit, and the cloud "poured out water" upon them as it passed from before them to the rear (Psa. 77:17; also Judges 5:4). *En*, as occurring in 1 Cor. 10:2, often means *with* or *by*. See Luke 11:20; 14:31; 22:49; Acts 1:5; 4:7; Rev. 6:8; 13:10; etc. Noah and his family were baptized with the flood, and they rode safe and dry over its waves (1 Peter 3:20, 21). The Saviour was baptized with His sufferings (Luke 12:50) when His sufferings were "laid upon Him" (Isa. 53:6). The Great Baptizer is Christ Himself, and He baptizes His people with the Holy Ghost when He "pours out" the Spirit upon them (Titus 3:5, 6, R. V.)

From all this it will be seen that the word *baptizo* in the Scriptures, as in all preceding literature, has no specific reference to mode, but expresses state or condition brought about, as the context shews, by the bap-

tizing element, whether fire, suffering, water, or the Spirit coming upon the subject. The word does not mean "to dip," or "to immerse," neither does it mean "to sprinkle" or "to pour." Immerse, sink, dip, often occur in the Old and New Testaments, and the Apocrypha, and are always rendered by the Greek words, *enduo*, *pontizo*, *buthizo*, *dupto*, *katapontizo*, *kataduo* or *bapto* (Psa. 69: 2, 15; 124: 4; Ex. 15: 4, 5, 10; 2 Mac. 12: 4; 1 Tim. 6: 9; Luke 5: 7; Matt. 18: 6; 14: 13; 26: 23; Mark 14: 20; John 13: 26.) When the sacred writers would express the idea of dip, etc., they always use one or other of the above words, and never use *baptizo*; and when they refer to the religious rite they always use *baptizo*, but never any of the above terms. There is no exception to this rule. Could anything more clearly prove that there is something in baptism that cannot be expressed by any of these words? If "dipping is baptizing, and baptizing is dipping," it is inconceivable that *baptizo* should never once be used interchangeably with words expressing dip, etc. Baptists challenge us to substitute "pour" or "sprinkle" for *baptizo*. Our reply is that we have never made the word *baptizo* the equivalent of "pour" or "sprinkle," or any other word of mere action. This would be to fall into the same blunder as immersionists, who see in the word, "mode and nothing but mode." Christian baptism is first, a powerful change in the soul produced by God's Spirit (1 Cor. 12: 13), and then water is used as a symbol to make manifest this internal change. But in every case, without exception, whether in real or in symbol baptism, the baptizing element *comes* upon the person baptized; the person baptized is never spoken of as dipped or plunged into the element. "If anything out of mathematics," says Dr. Dale, "Christic Baptism," p. 22, "was ever proved, it has been proved that this word *baptizo* does not mean *to dip*; that it never did, that it never can so mean without there be first an utter metamorphosis as to its essential character." The mode of the Spirit's baptism

is always "pouring," "shedding forth," "sprinkling," "coming down like rain," or "like showers," "falling upon" (Isa. 44 : 3 ; Ezek. 36 : 25-27 ; Psa. 72 : 6 ; Hos. 14 : 5 ; Joel 2 : 28, 29 ; John 1 : 32 ; Acts 2 : 17-33 ; 10 : 38 ; John 20 : 22).

Spiritual—that is, real baptism—is always by the Spirit coming upon the person baptized, and the symbol conforms to the real—the element comes upon the subject. The figure is as familiar as it is beautiful. Just as the rain descending out of heaven penetrates the earth and makes it fruitful, so the symbol of sprinkling or pouring sets forth the Spirit of life from God imparted to the dead, entering the heart, purging its corruption, and creating new life and growth.

Having traced *baptizo* in its mode and meaning from its first recorded occurrence in Pindar, B.C. 500, up through the pure classics, the Septuagint, the later Greek, and the New Testament, we might now fairly close our argument with the conclusion that, instead of the word meaning "dip and only dip in all Greek literature," no Greek writer, inspired or uninspired, ever uses the word in that sense. But as *baptizo* frequently occurs in some writers immediately following the New Testament era, we will examine a few instances in order to illustrate and confirm what we have shewn to be its meaning up to this time.

BAPTIZO IN THE POST-APOSTOLIC ERA.

Of all the examples later than the New Testament, even Conant translates about one-half by the words "whelm" and "overwhelm," which imply the application of the baptizing element to the subject. Josephus was a Jewish priest, who was made prisoner by Titus in the war which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem. He wrote his Jewish "Antiquities" and his "History" at Rome after A.D. 70. The word *baptizo* occurs in his writings fourteen times. We have al-

ready, on page 31, quoted from him where he speaks of vessels and men being baptized by the storm-raised waves, but these vessels and men were not sunk. The water came upon them.

In his narrative of the storm that followed the ship in which Jonah sailed (Antiq. Bk. 9, ch. 10, sec. 2) Josephus says:

Ὅσον οὕπω μέλλοντος βαπτίζεσθαι τοῦ σκάφους.

"The ship being just about to be baptized"—

that is, by the storm-raised waves dashing over it. The ship was not necessarily injured or ruined by the baptism. In his Antiq. Bk. 4, ch. 4, sec. 6, he says:

Τοὺς οὖν ἀπὸ νεκροῦ μεμιασμένους, τῆς τέφρας ὀλίγον εἰς πηγὴν ἐνιέντες καὶ ὕσσωπον, βαπτίσαντές τε καὶ τῆς τέφρας ταύτης εἰς πηγὴν, ἑρῶραινον τρίτῃ καὶ ἐβδόμῃ τῶν ἡμερῶν.

"Any persons being defiled by a dead body, they put a little of these ashes and hyssop into spring water, and baptizing with these ashes in water, sprinkled them on the third day and on the seventh."

This is a literal translation from the Greek. Josephus calls the purifying rite a baptizing, and he states the mode to have been "sprinkling." He does not depart from the previous usage of the word. Conant, on page 33, remodels the Greek text of this passage, and then attempts "to baptize hyssop" instead of the "man defiled by the dead." Thus he takes an unwarranted liberty with the text. He contradicts Moses (Num. 19: 20), and Paul (Heb. 9: 13), both of whom tell us that baptism from the dead was to be effected by sprinkling. But anything to save dipping.

Plutarch was born A.D. 50, and wrote probably about A.D. 80. He uses *baptizo* fifteen times. An instance

from him of "baptism" without "possibility of sinking" will be found on page 30. In his Life of Marcellus, ch. 15, he draws a sharp contrast between the "act of sinking" and "baptizing." (See Conant, Ex. 3.) In his "Physical Questions," he gives us a baptism by pouring. It is Conant, Ex. 66. Here is the Greek :

Διὰ τί τῷ οἴνῳ θάλασσαν παραχέουσι, καὶ χρησμόν τινα λέγουσιν ἀλιεῖς κομισθῆναι προστάττοντα βαπτίζειν τὸν Διόνυσον πρὸς τὴν θάλατταν;

And here is Conant's translation, which we readily accept :

"Why do they pour sea-water into wine, and say that men received an oracle commanding to baptize Bacchus (wine) in or at the sea?"

This passage, as with the arms of Samson, takes hold of the pillars of immersion, and shakes them into hopeless ruin. Dr. Carson's strong words on another passage suggest themselves, with a new application: "It would require the ingenuity of Satan" to put a dip here. The water was "poured" into the wine to baptize it, that is, by making it less intoxicating. As their warrant for so doing, Plutarch relates about the oracle commanding to baptize wine at the sea.

We may look at Conant, Ex. 86. It is from Æsop's Fables, of which the date is uncertain. A man is represented as taking revenge on a troublesome fox. The Greek reads :

Καὶ στυπεῖον ἐλαίῳ βαπτίσας, τῇ κερκῇ ταύτης προσδήσας, ὑφῆψε πυρί.

"And baptizing tow with oil, he bound it to her tail, and set fire to it."

Conant translates "dipping tow in oil." But this is inadmissible. There is no "in oil" in the Greek. The student will observe that "*elaio*" (oil) is in the instrumental dative, without a preposition, and cannot denote a receptive element. The construction is not an uncommon one. In James 5: 14 we read, "Anointing him with oil (*elaio*); in Matt. 6: 13 we have, "Anointed with oil (*elaio*) many that were sick;" in Luke 7: 46 we have, "My head with oil (*elaio*) thou did not anoint." Would any one say "anoint my head in oil?" Yet that would be as reasonable as saying that the tow was "dipped in oil." The anointing was by pouring (Mark 14: 3-8) and this tow was baptized with oil by having a little of the oil poured on it to make it burn longer and more intensely. So to-day, some pour coal oil upon kindling wood to facilitate its burning. The oil is poured on the wood, not the wood dipped into the oil.

What about other early instances? Irenaeus (A.D. 170) in his work, "Ad Her," Bk. 3, ch. 17, uses the *falling of rain* and "*pouring of water on dry wheat flour*" as types of baptism with water.

Origen (A.D. 240) represents the wood on the altar, over which water was *poured* at the command of Elijah (1 Kings 18: 33), as having been baptized.

"Baptism by tears" (*dia dakruon*) was a frequent expression with the early Christians. (See Dr. Dale's "Patristic Baptism," p. 514.) It would be nonsense to speak of a man, in fact or in figure, as dipped into his own tears.

Cyprian, who was constituted Bishop of Carthage, A.D. 248, speaking of some who were baptized by sprinkling, quotes Ezek. 36: 24, in justification of the practice, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean."

The water and blood shed from Christ's side were "baptisms," and are so called by Origen, Tertullian, Ambrose, Athanasius, John of Damascus, and the Syrian fathers.

We are now prepared to conclude with Dr. C. Hodge, Volume III., page 526 (slightly condensed), "In the classics, in the Septuagint, in the Apocryphal writings of the Old Testament, in the New Testament, and in the writings of the Greek fathers, the word *baptizo* is used with such latitude of meaning as to prove the assertion that the command to baptize is a command to immerse, to be utterly unauthorized and unreasonable."

THE ORIGIN OF IMMERSION FOR BAPTISM.

But if the validity of baptism in its Scriptural form by sprinkling was universally acknowledged by the Greek fathers, we enquire how came the Scriptural mode to be generally abandoned in the early centuries, and immersion to be substituted for it. The origin of dipping for baptism is not difficult to trace. Even in the apostles' days there was a disposition on the part of many to depart from the simplicity of the Gospel. This was particularly the case with regard to the sacraments of the Church. The apostle sharply reproves the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11) for their abuse of the Lord's Supper. And in the first chapter of the same epistle he utters this strange and significant declaration, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, least any should say that I had baptized in my own name."

But in the second and third centuries we find the state of things far more deplorable. The disposition to ascribe peculiar virtue to external forms had gone on constantly increasing until, by-and-by, *nude* immersions, accompanied with exorcism, anointing, and every species of superstition, fairly ran riot in unseemly and scandalous practice. It was thought that there was a saving virtue in the very water baptism. Just as it was believed that the bread and wine after consecration became the real body and blood of Christ, so it was believed that the water of baptism after the invocation possessed the *real*

presence of the Spirit. The natural conclusion from this was that the more water the better, and that the water should be applied to the whole body so that the regeneration might be complete. We, therefore, now find *trine* immersions in a nude state, accompanied with exorcism, unction, the giving of salt and milk to the candidate, clothing him in snow-white robes, and crowning him with evergreens. Mark well this fact, the very first mention of "dipping," as a mode of water baptism, is "threefold dipping," "in a nude state," "for the purpose of washing away the sins of the soul," accompanied by the "sign of the cross," "anointing with oil," "blessing the water," and other superstitious practices.

The first person to mention dipping for baptism is Tertullian, and in his "*De Corona Militis*," Tertullian frankly acknowledges that for *trine immersion*, oblations for the dead, the sign of the cross, etc. there was no Scripture authority. His words are: "Haremet aliarum ejusmodi disciplinarium silegem expostules scripturarum, *nullum invenies*." "For these and such like rules if thou requirest a law in the Scriptures, *thou shalt find none*." Again he says, "Dehinc ter mergitatur amplius respondentes, quam Dominus in Evangelio determinavit:" "Then we are three times immersed, answering somewhat more than the Lord prescribed in the Gospel." Baptist writers try to limit this confession to the "three times," but when we remember the well known fact that in the Old Latin Bible which Tertullian used, baptism is never called an immersion, we cannot doubt what he meant by the words, "*more than the Lord prescribed in the Gospel*." When Tertullian follows the law of Scripture, he speaks of "two baptisms (water and blood) *poured from the Saviour's side*" ("*De Baptismo*," ch. 16); and of the "aspersion of water" in baptism, "*periginem aquæ*" (*De Pœnitentia*, 6).

Baptists are fond of claiming the history of the early practice of the Church as wholly in their favor. But there is no early or ancient authority for immersion,

from Tertullian onward, that is not also an authority for the various superstitions that, from the beginning, accompanied immersion. "There is no historical fact," says Robinson, a Baptist historian, "better authenticated than this."

Thus, immersion as a mode of baptism came into use. It did not originate in the supposed fact that the early Christian fathers understood the word *baptizo* to mean "dip" or "immerse," or from any supposed Scripture authority for this mode. They believed in the "*real presence* of the Spirit in the blessed water," and they believed that the best way to secure the saving efficacy (*vis baptismatis*) of the "blessed water" was to put the person naked into it three times. It took three dips and a great deal more to constitute one "ancient" baptism.

EXCLUSIVE DIPPING A MODERN THEORY.

For sixteen hundred years after the commission to baptize was given, there is no evidence that any man ever put any other man, woman or child into and under water a single time and called such action "Christian baptism." Again, for sixteen hundred years after the commission was promulgated, there is no record that any man or set of men ever called in question the Scripture authority for baptism by sprinkling. The evidence for immersion stands wholly in the superstitious practices of the Catholic Church for more than a thousand years, in the bold assumptions of modern immersionists, and in the unwarranted concessions of a certain class of writers and speakers. But these practices, assumptions and concessions are unsustained by the historical usage of the word, and are utterly at variance with the teaching of Scripture.

The Greek and Roman Churches, while all through the "dark ages" practising threefold immersions, with many other superstitions, for baptism, always maintained the Scripture authority for baptism by effusion, aspersion

or sprinkling. I have before me "Notes on the Rubrics of the Roman Ritual," by the Rev. James O'Kane. He is one of the highest authority in the Roman Church. In Sec. 176, O'Kane tells us that the Greeks "very frequently baptized by effusion," and that in the Russo-Greek Church "both modes (immersion and effusion) are in use." In Sec. 177, O'Kane says, "It is quite certain that from the very beginning baptism was frequently conferred by effusion. * * * It is the common opinion of theologians that this (aspersion or sprinkling) was the mode used by the apostles in baptizing the multitude of converts mentioned in Acts 2:41." He then gives the following quotation from the Catechism of the Council of Trent (1546): "By the common custom and practice of the Church, there are three ways of administering baptism—immersion, effusion and aspersion; and that administered in any of these three ways it is valid, * * * aspersion, the manner in which there is reason to believe Peter administered baptism when on one day he converted and baptized three thousand persons (Acts 2:41)." The Greek and Roman Churches never claimed that immersion was the only mode of baptism, and never denied the Scriptural warrant for sprinkling as a mode of baptism. Prior to A.D. 1600, no man, or class of men of whom we have any record, regarded dipping as anything more than a *mode* of water baptism, or denied the Scriptural character of baptism by sprinkling. But we have seen that in all Greek literature up to the time of Christ, and for two hundred years after, there is not a single instance where *baptizo* means "to dip," that is, "to put into water and take out immediately." Dr. Kendrick, Baptist, and a professor of Greek in the Rochester University, says in the *Baptist Quarterly* for April, 1869, "*Baptizo never takes out what it puts into the water.*" And Dr. Conant, on p. 88, says, "there is no *emersion* (taking out of the water) in the Greek word." "*Immersion*," that is, putting into and under water, without "*emersion*," a taking out of the water, can only mean

to drown. Was this what our Lord commanded in the commission (Matt. 28 : 19) ?

BURIED WITH CHRIST.

Baptism, we are told, is a burial. And the ordinary Baptist imagines he has vanquished all opposition when he refers to Rom. 6 : 4 and Col. 2 : 12. But there is no reference in these passages to water-baptism.* In 1 Cor. 12 : 13, we read, "by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." It is to this baptism of the Holy Ghost that the apostle refers, as is evident from the effects ascribed to the baptism. In Col. 3 : 3, the apostle says, "Ye are dead and your life is *hid* (yes, buried) with Christ *in* God." Being baptized with the Holy Ghost, we are in point of law one with Christ. Thus the apostle says, "Crucified with Christ" (Rom. 6 : 6); "Sufferers with Christ" (Rom. 8 : 17); "Dead with Christ" (Rom. 6 : 8); "Buried with Christ" (Rom. 6 : 4); "Quickened with Christ" (Eph. 2 : 5); "Raised with Christ" (Eph. 2 : 6); "Seated with Christ" (Eph. 3 : 6); "Glorified with Christ" (Rom. 8 : 17). All these passages bring before us the indissoluble union between the believing soul and the Saviour, through which we are "dead to sin," and can "live no longer therein." Not by water, but by the Spirit of the Lord are we crucified, dead, buried, and risen with Christ. Let us pray for this baptism, and may the Spirit be poured out upon us, and the "blood of sprinkling" be applied to every heart.

* For a full discussion of Rom. 6 : 4, and Col. 2 : 12, see the Author's "Immersion, a Romish Invention," pp. 50-55.